

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2 and 7-15 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 7-8, and 12 are amended by the present amendment. Support for the amended claims can be found in the original specification, claims and drawings.<sup>1</sup> No new matter is presented.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-2 and 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Suzuki et al. (U.S. Pat. 5,699,474, herein Suzuki); and Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Mercier (U.S. Pat. 6,865,747).

In response to the rejection of Claims 1-2 and 7-12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Suzuki, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claims 1, 7-8 and 12 recite novel features clearly not disclosed by Suzuki.

Independent Claim 1, for example, relates to a transmitting apparatus for converting a coded bit stream into a trick play output (e.g., slow play, fast forward, fast rewind, etc.). More particularly, Claim 1 recites, in part, that the transmitting apparatus comprises:

... accumulating means for accumulating the coded bit stream ...  
***demultiplexing means for demultiplexing the coded bit stream  
accumulated in the accumulating means ...***  
rewriting means for rewriting control data which specifies a displaying  
order of the pictures ...  
***multiplexing means for multiplexing the coded bit stream for which  
the control data has been rewritten ...***

Independent Claims 7-8 and 12, while directed to alternative embodiments, are amended to recite similar features. Accordingly, the arguments presented below are applicable to each of independent Claims 1, 7-8 and 12.

---

<sup>1</sup> e.g., specification Fig. 1, p. 7, l. 26 – p. 8, l. 11 and p. 12, ll. 5-15.

Turning to the applied references, Suzuki describes a method and apparatus for decoding MPEG-type data reproduced from a recording medium during a high-speed reproduction operation.

Suzuki, however, fails to reach or suggest that the apparatus includes both a ***“demultiplexing means for demultiplexing the coded bit stream accumulated in the accumulating means ... [and] multiplexing means for multiplexing the coded bit stream for which the control data has been rewritten,”*** as recited in independent Claim 1.

In rejecting the claimed features directed to the “accumulating means,” the Office Action cites the buffer 401 shown in Figs. 3 and 4 of Suzuki. However, as described at col. 12, ll. 33-40 of Suzuki, the coded bit stream 400 stored in the buffer is output to an inverse variable length encoder 402 and undergoes inverse variable length coding before subsequently being displayed after further processing. Suzuki, however, fails to disclose that the coded bit stream 400 stored in the buffer 401 is demultiplexed, whatsoever. Therefore, Suzuki fails to disclose that his apparatus includes ***“demultiplexing means for demultiplexing the coded bit stream accumulated in the accumulating means,”*** as recited in amended independent Claim 1.

Independent Claim 1 is also amended to recite that the apparatus includes a ***“multiplexing means for multiplexing the coded bit stream for which the control data has been rewritten.”*** Suzuki fails to disclose a multiplexer that multiplexes the coded bit stream after the control data has been rewritten. Instead, as shown in Figs. 3-4, a selector 406 is used to directly output the decoded from the memories 411-414 for display, and the data is not multiplexed for subsequent output, as recited in independent Claim 1.

Thus, Suzuki fails to teach or suggest an apparatus that includes both a ***“demultiplexing means for demultiplexing the coded bit stream accumulated in the accumulating means ... [and] multiplexing means for multiplexing the coded bit stream for***

***which the control data has been rewritten,***” along with all the additional limitations required by amended independent Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of independent Claim 1 (and the claims that depend therefrom) under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn. For substantially similar reasons, Applicants submit that independent Claims 7-8 and 12 (and the claims that depend therefrom) patentably define over the applied references.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Mercier, Applicants note that Claims 13-15 depend from independent Claims 1 and 7-8, respectively, and are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Mercier fails to remedy the above noted deficiency of Suzuki.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 1-2 and 7-15 patentably define over the applied references. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of the application is therefore requested

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Bradley D. Lytle  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)

Andrew T. Harry  
Registration No. 56,959

I:\ATTY\ATH\PROSECUTION\275\275770US\275770US-AM-DUE-10-10-08.DOC